THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 14, No. 24 (Broadcast 668) June 10, 1968 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

FULBRIGHT AND THE WAR

Our involvement in the Vietnam war is an inevitable consequence of the internationalist foreign policy which was fabricated in the latter days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, and which was implemented and expanded by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

Senator J. William Fulbright — as much as any other man, and more than most — is responsible for that policy. He has supported every step toward American entanglement in foreign affairs.

Fulbright, a one-world internationalist, has been irritably intolerant of Americans who criticize the disastrous foreign policy he helped build. He calls them "super-patriots" and "isolationists," sarcastically remarking that isolationism rests on "the argument that the whole world is corrupt and that only if we cut off all contact with it, can we preserve our own purity."[1] That is a gross, deliberate distortion of truth.

Isolationists never wanted a hermit nation: they supported *private* foreign travel and trade; they encouraged *private* efforts to improve conditions abroad. They resisted the internationalist foreign policy of Fulbright, because they knew it would lead exactly where it has led: over-commitment of the American *government* in the affairs of other nations until America would become involved in endless wars and revolutions all over the earth, wasting the lives of our servicemen, and dissipating our economic resources, while our enemies arranged wars for us to fight and stirred up universal hatred of us because of our meddling.

Consider the SEATO Treaty. The Eisenhower administration took the lead in setting up the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), which was created at Manila in September, 1954, by a treaty of eight nations: the United States, Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand. The three new, independent, and neutral nations carved from the old French Union (Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam) were not parties to the SEATO Treaty; but they were part

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1968. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the "treaty area" which the eight SEATO nations pledged themselves to protect against communist aggression and subversion.

Mike Mansfield — presently one of Fulbright's fellow "doves" in the Senate; and then, as now, one of Fulbright's fellow members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee — was in the U.S. delegation which signed the SEATO Treaty in 1954. He praised it extravagantly.

In January, 1955, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the question of ratifying the SEATO Treaty. The Committee heard only one witness against the Treaty: Hamilton Fish — a man, then retired from politics, who had spent more than 20 years in the House and who was universally sneered at by the Fulbright crowd as an "isolationist."

In his testimony against the SEATO Treaty in January, 1955, Hamilton Fish said:

"I plead that ample time be allowed the American people to . . . learn . . . the warmaking provisions of this treaty before it is too late. At the present moment, the American public and . . . most Members of Congress except this committee have not the faintest idea of the extreme war commitments made in this treaty . . . .

"This Southeast Asia Defense Treaty . . . may be the death certificate of a million or more of the . . . youth of America in the bloody jungles of [Southeast Asia] . . . .

"The time has come for an open public debate before the American people whether they favor this new brand of super-internationalism that causes us to virtually police the entire world singlehanded with American blood and treasure . . . .

"Despite the Korean fiasco and its bloody holocaust, it is now seriously proposed that we enter into a binding treaty requiring us to send our Armed Forces to fight in defense of four small nations on the mainland of Asia where . . . we have no moral obligations or interest . . . . From an American point of view, it is a preposterous, suicidal proposal that could involve us in disastrous wars . . . .

"I am convinced that if this Southeast Asia pact is ratified it will result in a huge sacrifice of American lives and treasure in vain, in the jungles of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. Why should American boys be slaughtered in the rice paddies of Southeast Asia in a bloody war with countless hordes of fanatical communists? . . . For every thousand we send, red China can send her tens of thousands . . . . No matter what noble platitudes we used, the communist propaganda will depict us as foreign invaders or devils come to exploit Asiatics and reestablish colonialism and imperialism . . . .

"If this treaty is ratified, it will be an evil day for America. It would inaugurate a ghastly and tragic policy for which we will pay in blood, sweat, and tears for generations to come. Why not consult the American people before making any binding war commitments? Not one American in ten would favor our entrance into the war in Vietnam . . . . Nothing would be more unpopular. We cannot afford to squander our wealth, resources, or manpower all over the world without weakening our own economy and national defense, a condition which Moscow ardently desires . . . ."[2]

This, I remind you, was 13 years ago. The Foreign Relations Committee approved the SEATO Treaty 14 to 1; the Senate approved the resolution of ratification 95 to 1. The lone Senator against the SEATO Treaty in 1955 was William Langer (North Dakota Republican, now deceased) whom the Fulbright internationalists also derided as an "isolationist."

Lyndon Johnson, John F. Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Barry Goldwater — all members of the Senate in 1955 — approved the SEATO Treaty, and so did every other person who was in the Senate then and is still there now. This includes, specifically, the Senators now most bitterly outspoken against the Vietnam war which the SEATO Treaty made inevitable, just as Hamilton Fish told them it would: Fulbright of Arkansas, Symington of Missouri, Mansfield of Montana, Case of New Jersey, Morse of Oregon, Scott of Pennsylvania, Gore of Tennessee, Aiken of Vermont.

Fulbright in particular, and most other congressional "doves" in general, are now (in their efforts to win popular support for their pro-communist stand on Vietnam) using arguments (against our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"foreign entanglements" and our "unilateral efforts to police the world" and our "intervention in the affairs of other nations") which sound strangely like the arguments they were castigating a few years ago as "reactionary," "isolationist," "super-patriotic," "anti-intellectual."

Senator Fulbright has made another about-face with regard to the powers of the President.

On July 28, 1961, Fulbright delivered a filmed message to the Cubberly Conference at Stanford University. Fulbright said:

"The President is hobbled in his task of leading the American people to consensus and concerted action by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society far removed from the centers of world power.

"It is imperative that we break out of the intellectual confines of cherished and traditional beliefs and open our minds to the possibility that basic changes in our system may be essential to meet the requirements of the 20th century. . . ."[3]

Fulbright wanted the President free from constitutional restraints so that he could surrender the sovereignty of the United States to a world government. He said:

"In the present era, noninvolvement [of the United States in the affairs of other nations] is unthinkable and our proper objective must be the development of a broader community, a concert of free nations, transcending the limits of national frontiers and national perspectives. . . ."[3]

In January, 1963, Fulbright spoke to the 10th anniversary convocation of the Fund for the Republic in New York. According to the communist newspaper, *The Worker*, Fulbright demanded an enlargement of presidential powers in matters of foreign policy — an enlargement that would leave him free of public pressure and of congressional control. Fulbright, according to *The Worker*, cited with approval President Kennedy's handling of the Cuban crisis in 1962, saying that "decisions of the utmost gravity were made by the President with the assistance of only his most intimate advisors in the Executive Branch" and that the "leaders of Congress were quite properly informed but not consulted."[4]

But on March 11, 1968 — when Secretary of State Dean Rusk was being grilled in televised hearings before Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee — Rusk complained that Fulbright was trying to force him to testify publicly on information that would help the communists in Vietnam. Fulbright sarcastically retorted that he was not interested in the tactics of the war — that he merely wanted Congress consulted and given a greater role in shaping policy.[5]

In a speech to the Senate on March 25, 1964, Fulbright said:

"It is difficult to see how a negotiation, under present military circumstances, could lead to termination of the war under conditions that would preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. It is extremely difficult for a party to a negotiation to achieve by diplomacy objectives which it has conspicuously failed to win by warfare."[6]

Fulbright said the only "realistic options" open to us in Vietnam were to expand the conflict, or to renew our "effort to bolster the capacity of the South Vietnamese to prosecute the war successfully on its present scale."[6]

He said that whichever of these two routes our government chose to follow, "it should be clear to all concerned that the United States will continue to meet its obligations and fulfill its commitments with respect to Vietnam."[6]

In August, 1964, Fulbright fully supported the Tonkin Gulf Resolution approving "all necessary measures" against the North Vietnamese to repel aggression. Johnson used this Resolution as his "authority" for escalating the Vietnam war in 1965, in lieu of asking Congress for a legal declaration of war, as the Constitution requires.

At first, Fulbright supported this unconstitutional procedure. But before the end of 1965, he had reversed himself about Vietnam. Before the end of 1967, Fulbright had made a 180-degree turn, placing himself squarely on the side of communists, new-left anarchists, and black-power militants — not only with regard to the war in Vietnam, but also with regard to the guerrilla warfare which communists were inciting in the streets of America.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On February 19, 1967, Fulbright, appearing on the ABC national tv program, "Issues and Answers," deplored our policy in Vietnam, saying:

"It appears that we want to be complete masters of South Vietnam."[7]

In a speech to the American Bar Association at Honolulu on August 8, 1967, Fulbright said:

"If . . . the rain of bombs can bring Ho Chi Minh to reason, why should not the same principle apply at home?

"Why should not the riots and snipers' bullets bring the white man to an awareness of the Negro's plight when peaceful programs for housing and jobs and training have been more rhetoric than reality? . . .

"How can we commend democratic social reform to Latin America when Newark, Detroit and Milwaukee are providing explosive evidence of our own inadequate efforts at democratic social reform?"[8]

The Senator also repeated the insistent communist lie that the United States willingly spends billions to kill innocent people in immoral wars, but is brutally stingy and penny pinching about helping the poor and oppressed at home.[8]

On March 11, 1968, Dean Rusk expressed reluctance to appear before Fulbright's committee for another day of televised hearings. Fulbright said:

"It will be impossible to proceed with foreign aid unless we can complete the hearing."[9]

Foreign aid had nothing to do with the subject of the hearings. Fulbright was merely blackmailing Rusk. Fulbright so badly wanted to continue the televised hearings — which were immensely helpful and encouraging to our communist enemy — that he threatened to kill the foreign aid program, to which he himself is wholly devoted.

That same evening, however (March 11), Fulbright, on a nationally televised news program, flatly denied that he had made the threat or had even hinted retaliation against foreign aid.

This strange, powerful man is up for reelection again this year. What a blessing for the nation, if Arkansas voters would select a conservative to replace him in the Senate!

What a blessing for the nation if voters in other states, with senators and representatives who are working against the best interests of the United States and of the people they represent, would select constitutional conservatives to replace them!

A Congress of constitutionalists could save us from raging anarchy and from perpetual involvement in war — conditions which are a direct consequence of the policies of government supported by most of the men in our present Congress. Do your part in electing a Congress that will save our Republic! Use "Record of the 90th Congress" as an effective tool in your campaign. Price: 1 copy for $1.00, with free copies of the Constitution, amendments, and text of the Declaration of Independence, all with commentary.

Please notify us of any change of address *before* you move. With increased postal rates, we no longer can afford to remail issues returned by the Post Office.

FOOTNOTES

(1) "United States Senate; Address by J. W. Fulbright, U.S.S., Ark.," press release dated Wed., A.M., Sept. 9, 1959, 7 pp.

(2) *Congressional Record*, Feb. 1, 1955, pp. 1057-9 (bound)

(3) "Fulbright Should Be Fired For Views on Constitution," San Diego, Calif., *Evening Tribune*, Aug. 14, 1961, editorial page

(4) Article by Mike Davidow, *The Worker*, Jan. 27, 1963

(5) "Rusk vs. Senators: The War Explained," *U.S. News & World Report*, Mar. 25, 1968, pp. 74-8

(6) *Congressional Record*, Mar. 25, 1964, pp. S6033-4

(7) "Fulbright Calls for Compromise Peace," *Chicago Tribune*, Feb. 20, 1967, Sec. 3, p. 9

(8) Article by Jack Landau, *The* (Newark) *Star-Ledger*, Aug. 9, 1967, pp. 1, 19

(9) AP dispatch from Wash., D.C., Mar. 12, 1968

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 3% for Sales Tax

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED